



## An Exploring Study on the Linkage Possibility of the Support Policies in Multicultural Family and Multicultural Education for Social Integration

Soo An Choi, Min Joo Kim

**To cite this article :** Soo An Choi, Min Joo Kim (2021) An Exploring Study on the Linkage Possibility of the Support Policies in Multicultural Family and Multicultural Education for Social Integration , Journal of Multiculture and Education, 6:1, 117-143

① earticle에서 제공하는 모든 저작물의 저작권은 원저작자에게 있으며, 학술교육원은 각 저작물의 내용을 보증하거나 책임을 지지 않습니다.

② earticle에서 제공하는 콘텐츠를 무단 복제, 전송, 배포, 기타 저작권법에 위반되는 방법으로 이용할 경우, 관련 법령에 따라 민, 형사상의 책임을 질 수 있습니다.

[www.earticle.net](http://www.earticle.net)

# 07

## An Exploring Study on the Linkage Possibility of the Support Policies in Multicultural Family and Multicultural Education for Social Integration

Soo An Choi<sup>\*</sup> · Min Joo Kim<sup>\*\*</sup>

Inha University, Korea · Seoul National University, Korea

⋮

### Abstract

The rapid transition of Korean society to a multicultural society has led to the inevitability of multicultural policies. Despite the government-led multicultural policies, Korea does not fully reflect the characteristics and problems of various types of international migrants and their families. This study did comparative analysis on the policies of the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family(MOGEF) and the Ministry of Education(MOE) and tried to examine the linkage between them and figured out the implications. In order to analyze the linkage between the two policies, in this study, the analysis is carried out in two axes: policy area and policy target. The results and issues are as follows: First, the redefinition and linkage of policy targets should be made. Secondly, it is necessary to create a unified policy direction through the examination of multicultural discourse. Finally, policies related to structural and identity integration are required, and for this, a bottom-up approach is needed.

**Keywords:** Social Integration, Multicultural Family Policy, Multicultural Education Policy, Comparative Analysis on Policy

\* First author, Dept of multicultural education, Inha university (hsu.choi@gmail.com)

\*\* Corresponding author, Graduate School of Public Administration (kimminjoo@snu.ac.kr)

## I. Introduction

The rapid transition of Korean society to a multicultural society has led to the inevitability of multicultural policies. The most important reason for promoting social policy is not to divide society but to achieve social integration(Hyun Jin-kwon, 2013). Therefore, the ultimate goal of the policy is to integrate formal residents and multicultural people who have diverse cultural backgrounds.

In Korea, migrant workers began to flow quickly from the late 1980s. And in the 1990s, marriage migrant women increased rapidly. Since the 2000s, overseas Koreans and international students have entered Korea. Multicultural policies are being implemented to resolve social conflicts arising from this.

Troper(1999) defined multicultural policies as government policies and programs that protect socio-cultural diversity and ensure that all individuals have equal access to opportunities without discrimination or exclusion by race, ethnicity, or nationality. Kim Jun-sik and Ahn Kwang-hyun(2012) defined multicultural policies as considering diversity in society and improving the quality of life of multicultural members through the respect of minorities, while Kim Myung-sung(2009) defined it as a policy effort to deal with the social rights of immigrants and minorities. Min Ga-young(2011) defined it as a social safety net to allow migrants to live as equal social citizens without becoming social neighbors. Lee Jong-yoon(2010) said that the success of multicultural policies guarantees the human rights and welfare of multicultural populations in Korean society. To sum up, multicultural policies are the government's institutional efforts to recognize the diversity of multicultural societies and to guarantee the rights of minorities based on them.

Korea has a multicultural policy under the lead of the government. In addition, the MOGEF and the MOE are announcing the 3rd master plan for Multicultural Family Policy(2018-2022) and annual Multicultural Education Support Plan. These plans present policy tasks with a common vision of "an open multicultural society of participation and coexistence". The main policy targets of them are multicultural families and their children to enable their initial adaptation and stable settlement in the long term. However, overlapping policy targets have

reduced the efficiency and effectiveness of policy enforcement. Korea's multicultural policy does not fully reflect the characteristics and problems of various types of international immigrants and their families, and it will be difficult to achieve the ultimate goal of social integration due to policy groups divided into marriage immigrants, their children, Koreans and foreigners (Kang Ki-jung, 2014; Im Eun-ui, 2020; Hwang Jung-mi, 2010). In this regard, it is necessary to present effective social integration policies through a comparative analysis of multicultural policies in Korea. Therefore, among multicultural policies, this study would like to explore the possibility of connections and derive implications for a multicultural society for coexistence through a comparative analysis of multicultural family policies and multicultural education policies.

## II. Theoretical Background

### 1. Multicultural society and Social Integration Policies

The definition of a multicultural society is as follows; Kymlica(1995) stated that a multicultural society refers to a multi-ethnic society or a multi-ethnic society that has been immigrated from another region. Kim Hye-soon(2007) said that a multicultural society is a society in which race and ethnicity are not grounds for discrimination in acquiring and enjoying political, economic, social and cultural rights that citizens can enjoy. Furthermore, Kim Hak-tae(2015) argued that the definition of multicultural society is a unified community. In other words, in a multicultural society, nationality, cultural background, and eligibility to stay are irrelevant. Instead, it means a society where everyone can enjoy their rights as citizens and coexist. In 2006, the Korean government declared that our society entered a multicultural society(Lee Hae-woong, 2012). The fact that Korea has become a multicultural society means that it needs to decide from what perspective it will integrate 'difference' from various cultural phenomena(Kim Young-soon, 2017). Accordingly, the government is implementing social integration policies for multicultural societies.

For the types of social integration policies in multicultural societies, Castles

and Miller (1998) categorized them based on cultural inclusion; differential exclusionary model, assimilationist model, and multicultural models. The differential exclusionary model is an integrated model that accepts unwanted migrant and then separates them from certain areas. In addition, most migrants are considered strangers, not members of society, and are not integrated into policy targets. This model is mainly taken by countries that have emphasized mono-ethnicity. The assimilationist model aims to become a member of the inflow country society by giving up the language, culture, and social characteristics unique to the country of origin. Migrants lose their existing characteristics and cultural identity as they adapt to the cultural behavior and institutional norms of the influx country. In other words, this model is the policy that unilaterally integrate migrants into the influx society (Park Jin-kyung, 2010: 175). The multicultural model recognizes and encourages migrants to maintain their own cultural characteristics, and aims at coexistence with minorities and mainstream society. The multicultural model argues that recognition of immigrants' unique identities can prevent social divisions and conflicts (Ji et al., 2009: 113–115). However, Koopmans et al. (2005) pointed out that Castles & Miller's types does not explain the integration policy's dynamic process. Also, they simply divides the types into 'ethnic' and 'civil-territorial' based on the principle of denization, and then divides them into 'cultural monism' and 'cultural pluralism' based on the acceptance of cultural differences and collective rights (Yoo, 2011). The former studies above mainly looked at the direction of policies from a macro perspective. This is useful to suggest an alternative direction to the direction of policy as a multicultural society. One of the reasons why Korean multicultural policies do not function is that there is no conceptual definition of this direction (Kim, 2015:22).

However, Lee et al. (2009) pointed out that discussions only on macroscopic aspects of integration, making it difficult to find domain-specific access to integration. In addition, the integration targets are affected by various political, social, and cultural situations, including the history of migration/immigration in each country, indicating that there are difficulties in setting the scope and that sufficient consideration is required for the specificity of individual societies. Meanwhile, Jin & Lim (2014) presented a co-prosperity and communication

model for each agent, and suggested a Korean-style social integration policy model that fits the reality and situation of Korea. This model aims to adapt both Koreans and migrants to each other through continuous communication. Based on this communication and mutual adaptation, it will also form a common culture, expand the role of civil society and migrants, and create a harmonious society in which the roles of the three agents (government, Koreans, and migrants) can be effectively blended to be co-prosperity. Therefore, In addition to looking at Korea's multicultural policy at the macro level of social integration policy, discussions at the micro level are also needed to integrate multicultural policies implemented by each department in charge. In particular, discussions are essential to resolve the overlap of policy targets and policy contents, which is a point where Korea's multicultural social integration policy is criticized, and link them to integration. Therefore, this study has its significance in that it seeks to link multicultural family policies with multicultural education policies that have not been conducted so far and seek social integration.

## 2. The Ministry of Gender Equality and Family's 『The 3rd Master plan for Multicultural Family Policy』

### 1) Policy Background

The *MULTICULTURAL FAMILIES SUPPORT ACT*, enacted in March 2008, aims to contribute to improving the quality of life and social integration of multi-ethnic family members by allowing them to lead a stable family life and fulfill their roles and responsibilities as members of society (Ministry of Government Legislation, 2015), and the Multicultural Family Support Policy is based on this. The MOGEF conducts an investigation on multicultural families every three years to establish the foundation for promoting multicultural family policies, and establishes a multicultural family policy committee to promote the efficiency of related policies. The 1<sup>st</sup> master plan was established for between 2010 and 2012, the 2<sup>nd</sup> master plan is for between 2013 and 2017, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> master plan is for between 2018 and 2022.

Despite the fact that the master plan for multicultural family policy, as its name

suggests, is aimed at 'multicultural families', multicultural families as policy targets have been criticized for their narrow definition (Kang Ki-jung, Park Soo-sun, 2014). In fact, in the 1<sup>st</sup> plan, the word was used only as an auxiliary expression to refer to their children, but the 2<sup>nd</sup> plan aimed to classify multicultural families as separate policy targets and establishes an adaptation-oriented policy base. In order to cope with the changing types of multicultural families, the 3<sup>rd</sup> master plan expanded the range of definition from 'Koreans and marriage immigrants(or naturalized)' to 'bastardizing or naturalized Koreans and marriage immigrants(or naturalized)'. Meanwhile, the long-term settlement ratio of marriage immigrants for more than 10 years has increased to 34% in 2012, 48% in 2015, and 60% in 2018 (National Statistics Office, 2019). Unlike the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> plan which focused on early adaptation, the 3<sup>rd</sup> plan is defined as a marriage immigration settlement period and strengthened support to promote stable family life, such as protecting the human rights of marriage immigrants. Furthermore, the rising percentage of children from multi-ethnic families in adolescence was reflected in the 3<sup>rd</sup> plan.

## 2) Policy Tasks

Due to the increasing long-term settlement rate of marriage naturalizers, the 3<sup>rd</sup> master plan proposes policy tasks to improve human right for long-term settlement rate, the life cycle support of children, and the acceptability of multiculturalism. The detailed tasks are as followed in <Table 1>.

<Table 1> Policy Task of the 3rd master plan(2018–2022)

Goal	Policy tasks
I. Support for long-term settlement of multicultural families	1. Strengthening human rights for married migrant women
	2. Prevention damage of international marriages
	3. Supporting a stable family life
	4. Activating service linkage
II. Expanding social and economic participation of marriage immigrants	1. Strengthening self-reliance capabilities
	2. Internalization of employment and start-up support
	3. Expand opportunities for social participation
III. Supporting stable growth of multi-ethnic children and capabilities building	1. Create an environment for stable growth
	2. Support academic and global competency building
	3. Career preparation and social advancement support
	4. Expand customized support for immigrant children

Goal	Policy tasks
IV. Improving acceptability of social and multiculturalism based on mutual respect	1. Creating a social environment in which human rights and diversity are respected
	2. Promoting multicultural education
	3. Making multicultural-friendly media environment
	4. Creating a regional environment and promoting participation and exchange programs
V. Strengthening the promotion system for cooperative policy management	1. Strengthening cooperation among policy promotion systems
	2. Internalization of a Multicultural Family Support system

Source: The 3rd Master plan for Multicultural Family Policy. (MOGEF, 2018)

First of all, the first policy goal is to support stable family life, which establishes a domestic violence response system, and strengthens human rights in response to various situations caused by the long-term settlement of multicultural families. In other words, if the initial policy focused on 'adapting well', it assumes that it will pay attention to and solve problems that arise within multicultural families.

The second policy goal is to promote economic independence and social participation by expanding programs and internalizing employment and start-up services to strengthen marriage immigrants' self-reliance capabilities. Provided that the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> master plans proposed strengthening capacity and expanding socioeconomic expansion, the 3<sup>rd</sup> plan seeks ways for them to participate.

The third policy goal is to create an environment, strengthen academic and global capabilities for stable growth of multicultural families, and support early adaptation and settlement of immigrant youths. Looking at the change among the master plans, it is intended to incorporate the influx of immigrant youths into the policy target according to the diversifying family types. Through this, the government seems to be focusing more on educating the immigrant's children as talented people than on marriage immigrants. Kim Eun-kyung (2020) also, in the same context, evaluated this situation as a policy design to reconstruct marriage immigrants from dependent groups to benefit groups and back to dependent groups.

The fourth policy goal is to improve social and multicultural acceptance based on mutual respect, which aims to create a media environment for expanding

[Provider:article] Download by IP 165.246.136.212 at Friday, July 23, 2021 11:44 AM



multicultural understanding education based on mutual respect and enhancing acceptability. Although the master plan has been implemented since 2010, Korea's multicultural acceptability is still insufficient. The multicultural acceptance index fell to 52.81 in the 2018 survey, compared with 53.95 in 2015 (the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, 2018). Thus, the policy reflected the need to create a social environment in which human rights and diversity are respected and promote multicultural understanding education.

The fifth policy goal is to strengthen the promotion system for cooperative multicultural family policy management, which aims to continue the cooperative system with major partners and internalize the service delivery system. Multicultural policy has been pointed out low effectiveness of policies due to excessive decentralization and policy overlap. Therefore, the 3<sup>rd</sup> master plan uses the word 'cooperation' to make changes. However, this still seems to be a challenging task to achieve. The number of central administrative agencies related to multicultural family policy is gradually increasing to 11 in the 1st, 12 in the 2nd, and 17 in the 3rd. But it is hard to find active policy dimensions that can mediate this cooperatively.

### 3. The Ministry of Education's Multicultural Education Support Policy

#### 1) Policy Background

While education issues of multicultural children, immigrant youth, and foreign students emerged as social concerns and the need for mutual understanding education between students from different ethnic, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds emerged, the government came up with a systematic multicultural education policy (Eun Ji-yong, 2020). Accordingly, the government has annually established a plan to support multicultural education since 2006 by newly identifying children of international marriage families and children of foreign workers as education alienation class. In 2007, the National Assembly enacted and revised *MULTICULTURAL FAMILIES SUPPORT ACT* and *FRAMEWORK ACT ON TREATMENT OF FOREIGNERS RESIDING IN THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA*.

Currently, the support for multicultural education has been carried by Article 4 of *FRAMEWORK ACT ON EDUCATION*, Article 10 of *MULTICULTURAL FAMILIES SUPPORT ACT*, and Article 19 of *ENFORCEMENT DECREE OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT* to support multi-ethnic students' customized education and raise awareness of multicultural society. The main agent of the support is MOE and the National Institute for Lifelong Education, while working in conjunction with municipal ministry of education and multicultural education support centers in each city.

The government's support included social adaptation and human rights protection and Korean language education for immigrants with weak legal, economic, and social backgrounds (Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development, 2006). In Roh Moo-hyun administration, the scope of multicultural education has begun to include not only students from different cultural backgrounds, but also existing Korean students under the name of 'general public'. Due to social educational needs, foreign workers and international marriages children began to be included as policy target in Lee Myung-bak administration.

## 2) Policy Tasks

The multicultural education support policy has set new policy goals and policy promotion tasks every year according to social changes, focusing on ensuring educational opportunities and bridging educational gaps to achieve a desirable state of 'open multicultural society of participation and coexistence'. In particular, from the plan for 2020 uses the term 'equal starting line' to narrow the gap between multi-ethnic students' entry into public education and educational preparation. Thus, this study, as shown in the table 2, covers the plan from 2018 to 2021 which timely correspondence with the MOGEF's 3<sup>rd</sup> master plan.

〈Table 2〉 Main Tasks of the Multicultural Education Support Policy (2018–2021)

Goal	Policy Task
I. Ensuring educational opportunities for equal starting line	1. Building a entry system into public education
	2. Bridging the gap in school preparation
II. Supporting school adaptation and stable growth	1. Support customized Korean language education
	2. Support for school adaptation and talent development
III. Creating a school environment where diversity coexists	1. Expand multicultural education for all students
	2. Improving teachers' multicultural capabilities
	3. Connections to homes and communities
IV. Internalization of Multicultural Education Support System	1. Improvement of multicultural education legislation
	2. Support education in response to Corona19
	3. Strengthening central–regional cooperation

Source: Multicultural Education Support Policy (MOE, 2018;2019;2020;2021)

The first policy goal is to ensure educational opportunities for equality of starting line in order to guarantee the practical educational rights of multi–ethnic student. To do this, information delivery is facilitated to multi–ethnic parents by distributing it to related institutions that frequently visited by them. In order to bridge the gap in preparation for school education, diagnostic tools linking the revised Nuri curriculum and the Korean language curriculum(KSL) of elementary schools are being distributed from the kindergarten stage, and mentoring activities are being conducted by college students.

The second policy goal is to support school adaptation and stable growth. It will include support for Korean language and basic education for the adaptation of multi–ethnic students and support for fostering human resources that utilize the characteristics of migration background. To adapt to elementary and middle schools, the school operates a “Stepping Stone” course before admission(January to February) and early semester period(July to August) to provide preparatory education for multi–ethnic students who are scheduled to enter and transfer to school. In addition, as MOE pointed out that multicultural education support relatively lacked in migration background and cultural diversity, policies related to emotional support began to be proposed.

The third policy goal is creating a school environment where diversity coexists. It will enhance the multicultural capacity of students and teachers and expand opportunities for parents and local communities to participate in

multicultural educational activities. All students have been encouraged to provide multicultural understanding education in connection with curriculum and creative experiential activities. Since 2018, multicultural education has been proposed as a crosscurricula theme and advised to have class more than two hours a year. For teachers, training and workshops will be conducted in cooperation with related institutions such as the National Institute of Korean Language, the Central Multicultural Education Center, and the Central Institute of Education. For incumbent teachers, more than 15 hours of training are recommended annually, and for prospective teachers, education related to multicultural education is also encouraged to be organized in the teacher training curriculum.

The fourth policy goal is the internalization of a multicultural education support system. At the central government level, efforts are seen to improve laws and systems related to multicultural education. At the local government level, it operates multicultural programs tailored to regional characteristics. However, policies have been criticized due to severe division into central and regional areas, raising the issue of overlapping policy implementation. Policy tasks with similar purposes between ministries are set up and implemented in duplicate, resulting in dual support of the national budget and personnel. As a solution, the plan for 2020 establishes a multicultural education support group so that teachers with abundant experience in multicultural education model schools can strengthen multicultural capabilities and build networks through regional recommendations. In addition, the government is expanding its online video content production, distribution and support system for Korean language education as a way to cope with Corona 19, and plans to produce supporting textbooks or video contents for core vocabulary that multi-ethnic students find difficult. In case of multi-ethnic students who need intensive Korean language education, face-to-face guidance will be provided.

### III. Research Result

Lee et al. (2009) mentioned the need for domain-specific division of

integration, and categorized it into cultural integration, identity integration, and structural integration. Cultural integration is a process in which the values and beliefs of migrants develop, develop and understand cognitive abilities of the culture of the influx country, and internalize values and norms to change the belief system. Identity integration is defined as a matter of subjective feeling and belonging to an individual or group. Finally, structural integration means the participation of migrants in the system of the inflow country at an institutional level. In this study, the analysis is based on these analysis frames, referring to the classification of policy actors suggested by Jin & Lim (2014), the analysis is carried out in two axes: policy area and policy target. The results showed that both policies were focused on cultural integration and presented structural integration policies at the ministry level.

First of all, cultural integration division includes ‘Creating an Environment’, ‘Building Capacity’, and ‘Education Support’. Creating an environment is classified as a policy area that facilitates interaction among members within the family, society, and school. Capacity building refers to support and career guidance for multi-ethnic students to grow into talents in Korean society. Education support means promoting school adaptation by smoothly incorporating into public education and supporting multicultural-related education for all members. Secondly, structural integration division includes ‘Institutional Cooperation’. Institutional cooperation was classified into policies area on cooperation between national administrative agencies, local governments, etc. The distribution of the policy area is tabulated in the following <Table 3>.

<Table 3> Distribution of policy areas of the MOGEF and MOE

Target \ Area	Cultural Integration						Structural Integration	
	Creating an Environment		Building Capacity		Education Support		Institutional Cooperation	
	MOGEF	MOE	MOGEF	MOE	MOGEF	MOE	MOGEF	MOE
Multi-ethnic parents	o					o		
Multi-ethnic students	o	o	o	o	o	o		
General public	o	o			o	o		
Insti-tution	School	o	o			o	o	
	Central Government		o				o	o
	Local Government						o	o

As <Table 3> suggested, a substantial portion of the multicultural policies of the two administrations are overlapping. Therefore, this study analyzed the linkage characteristics and discussed the improvements in multicultural policy. However, the analysis of this study only covers the areas that can be linked. For example, MOGEF's Policy Tasks 1 and 2 in the 'I. Support for Long-Term Settlement of Multi-ethnic Families' and 'II. Expanding social and economic participation of marriage immigrants' was excluded.

### 1. Multi-ethnic parents

The policy linkage between MOGEF and MOE is shown in the <Table 4>.

<Table 4> Policy Linkage in multi-ethnic parents

Area	MOGEF	MOE
	Policy Tasks	Policy Tasks
Creating an Environment	III,1-② Strengthening juvenile counseling support III,1-④ Providing information by child development cycle	
Education Support		I,1-① Supporting procedures for entering public education II,2-③ Career guidance and emotional support

Although both MOGEF and MOE propose policies targeting marriage immigrants, as <Table 4>, there are differences in policy areas and policy targets. The policy targets of MOGEF are parents of multi-ethnic families, and policy areas are tailored to create an environment in which they can live well as multi-ethnic families. However, MOE's policy targets are parents of multi-ethnic students including those of MOGEF, and the policy area focuses on the role of supporting children's education well.

MOGEF focuses on creating an environment for stable growth and capacity of children of multi-ethnic families. For this, Healthy Family & Multicultural Family Support Center aims to improve parent-child relationships, strengthen parental education, counseling and information provision by child development cycle, and support child creativity and personality. MOE distributes information

to related institutions that frequently visited by multi-ethnic students and parents to increase access to public education. In addition, ‘Dream Letters’ for each school level will be distributed six times a year in four languages(Chinese, Vietnamese, English, and Russian), where multi-ethnic parents can participate in the planning and monitoring to reflect their opinions.

Looking at the linkage points, a plan is required to allow multi-ethnic parents, the policy target of MOE, to participate in programs for environment creation operated by MOGEF.

## 2. Multi-ethnic students

The policy linkage characteristics in multi-ethnic students are shown in the <Table 5>.

<Table 5> Policy Linkage in multi-ethnic students

Area	MOGEF	MOE
	Policy Tasks	Policy Tasks
Creating an Environment	III.1-1 Spreading ‘well-rounded’ programs III.1-⑤ Customized services for multi-ethnic youths in crisis through the integrated support system for local youth III.4-③ Operating programs for immigrant children’s psychological and emotional stability	IV.1-② Improvement of procedures for entering public education for multi-ethnic students
Building Capacity	III.1-③ Various extracurricular activities(foreign language, arts, physical education, etc) III.2-① Reinforcing bilingual talent development projects III.2-③ Promoting Global Bridge Project III.2-④ Activate participation in international exchange programs III.3-① Expanding juveniles’ career experience opportunities III.3-② Expand classrooms for career guidance and counseling III.3-③ Training next-generation	II.2-② Support for the development of bilingual strengths II.2-③ Career guidance and emotional support

Area	MOGEF	MOE
	Policy Tasks	Policy Tasks
	professionals and youth internship III.3-④ Operating vocational education and finding best case III.4-⑥ Operation of Multicultural Youth Employment Academy	
Education Support	III.2-② Expanding programs to strengthen basic learning skills III.4-① Improving qualitative Korean language education for immigrant children III.4-② Expansion and diversification of Rainbow Schools to help early adaptation of Immigration children III.4-④ Revitalizing the operation of the Academic Review Committee to support children entering public education III.4-⑤ Expansion of multicultural pre-schools	I.1-① Supporting procedures for entering public education I.2-② Guidance on transfer to domestic schools collaborating with Related Institutions I.2-① Preparation of a support system at the kindergarten stage I.2-② Establishing Stepping Stone course to adapt to elementary/middle schools II.1-① Strengthening Korean language education in the early stages of arrival II.1-② Support for the operation of Korean language curriculum II.2-① Support for the basic educational background

According to <Table 5>, both MOGEF and MOE are presenting environment creation, capacity building, and education support policy areas for them. However, there is a difference that MOGEF only targets children of multi-ethnic families while MOE has more broad targets including those of MOGEF.

In environment creation area, MOGEF supports customized services for multi-ethnic youths in crisis through a ‘well-rounded’ program run by the Healthy Family & Multicultural Family Support Center with local institutions. In addition, a psychological and emotional support program is operated for intermediate-immigration students. MOE shall guarantee educational rights under the UN Convention on the Rights of multi-ethnic Students and prepare procedures for stable entry into public education.

In the area of capacity building, MOGEF proceed the ‘Global Bridge’ project to foster bilingual talent and develop various talents. In addition, it will enable bilingual students to participate in various activities by promoting participation in international exchange programs. It also seeks to expand job experience



opportunities and revitalize youth interns to support students' careers, and operates 'Multicultural Youth Employment Academy' only for intermediate-immigration children(Ⅲ.4-⑥). Meanwhile MOE distributes bilingual e-textbooks, holds a "National Bilingual Speech Contest", and associate with LG Multicultural School's language courses to continuously develop bilingual skills. In the case of career education, career education program takes into account the characteristics of migrant youth and it is notable that it is for all students to participate.

In the area of education support, MOGEF promotes expanding the operation of basic learning skills for children of multi-ethnic families(Ⅲ.2-②), and presents separate policies(e.g. Ⅲ.4-①~⑤) only for intermediate-immigration children such as 'Rainbow School', and 'Naeil Irum School' for Out-of-School Youth. Meanwhile, MOE supports procedures for multi-ethnic students to enter public education and provides customized support for each school age.

Looking at the linkage points, MOE's policy targets should be fairly considered in the policy areas of MOGEF as discussed above. For example, customized services at the community level for multicultural juvenile in crisis, implemented by the MOGEF, need to be associate with multi-ethnic students or unregistered migrant children in crisis. Secondly, in the area of capacity building, while MOE links textbook distribution and competitions with post-processes for bilingual motivation, MOGEF is promoting various capabilities of multi-ethnic students as well as bilingual programs. Kim Ki-young(2017) claims that since the beginning of the multicultural education policy, migrant children are considered 'socially vulnerable' and are considered 'subject to support' with the assumption that migrant children will have a low level of Korean and basic education. Therefore, MOE should develop more various field to enhance their capacity rather than solely focused on bilingualism. Finally, as part of the education support area, as MOGEF operates 'Rainbow School' and 'Naeil Irum School' for out-of-school youth, even if it happens outside the school, related information and the status of students needs to be cooperated with MOE.

### 3. General Public (including ordinary students, general citizen including public officials, ordinary soldiers, parents)

The characteristics of the policy linkage in general public are as below <Table 6>.

<Table 6> Policy Linkage in general public

Area	MOGEF	MOE
	Policy Tasks	Policy Tasks
Creating an Environment	IV.1-① Discovery and improvement of discriminatory legal and institutional issues	II.2-③ Career guidance and emotional support
	IV.1-② Periodic monitoring and reflux(e.g. Multicultural Acceptance Attitudes survey)	III.1-① Multicultural education throughout the school curriculum
Education Support	IV.3-① Reinforcing deliberation of the Korea Communications Standards Commission	III.3-① Expanding opportunities for parents to participate in multicultural educational activities
	IV.3-② Making media contents guidelines	
	IV.3-③ Discovery of cases of operation and improvement of the Media Monitoring Team	
	IV.3-④ Multilateral promotional projects	
Education Support	IV.2-④ Revitalization of multicultural education for the general public	
	IV.2-⑤ Multicultural education for public service providers	

According to <Table 6>, MOGEF has a policy task for the general public in the environmental creation and education support area, while MOE has for environmental creation. This stems from the difference in the duties of ministries.

The legal basis for supporting multicultural families is *MULTICULTURAL FAMILIES SUPPORT ACT*, and MOGEF takes charge of it. According to Article 5 of the act, the state and local governments should provide multicultural understanding education and take necessary measures to prevent social discrimination and prejudice against multicultural families. Meanwhile, under the Article 28 (1) of *GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT*, MOE shall be in charge of human resource development policies, school education, lifelong education, and academic affairs. That is, as shown in the <Table 6>, the reason why MOE have a task for multi-ethnic student not for general public.

In the perspective of environment creation area, both ministries' tasks can be

summarized by providing multicultural-friendly contents and strengthening access to information. First of all, the contents of policies related to the provision of contents are as follows: MOGEF takes efforts to create a multicultural-friendly media environment such as broadcasting and media in order to enhance social and multicultural acceptability. MOE suggests creative experience activities linked to school curriculum(Ⅲ,1-①). In addition, not only multi-ethnic students but also all students are required to participate in the ‘online career mentoring’ involving role models such as naturalized talents(Ⅱ,2-③). Secondly, the contents of the policy relating to strengthening access to information are as follows: MOGEF intends to improve discriminatory social phenomena, analyzes and monitors policy effects by reflecting feedbacks(Ⅳ,1-②). And, it also discovers discriminatory legal and institutional issues in daily life(Ⅳ,1-①) and diversifies promotional projects to enhance multicultural water availability(Ⅳ,3-④). MOE intends to increase access to information by providing information on multicultural education through the Multicultural Education Portal([www.edu4mc.or.kr](http://www.edu4mc.or.kr)) as well as producing and distributing multilingual school newsletters(Ⅲ,3-①).

Next, in the perspective of education support, MOGEF is promoting a policy to expand the scope of multicultural understanding education. Education instructors are dispatched to companies, schools, organizations, etc., and multicultural understanding education is provided to public officials who provide services to multicultural families(Ⅳ,2-⑤). Remarkably, as multi-ethnic youths have grown over time since Korea entered a multicultural society, it is provided for multi-ethnic soldiers to adapt to military service.

Looking at the connection points, firstly regarding on environment creation area, it will be possible to provide common guidelines for contents production and supply so that multicultural-friendly contents can maintain unity. If the direction of early multicultural education was focused on ‘adaptation’ and ‘assimilation’, efforts are now being made to recognize and respect individuals from various cultural backgrounds while maintaining their ethnic identity. In line with the direction of these policies, both ministries should have a common direction. Second, it is necessary to consider what MOGEF is in charge of providing education support. Although MOGEF is conducting the project on general people, MOE who in charge of lifelong education does not promote it.

As a linkage point, MOE can take the lead in developing educational programs that can include lifelong global civic education or global civic education, and MOGEF shall conduct and manage them.

#### 4. Institutions

##### 1) Schools and teachers

Due to government organization and its tasks, the policy on schools are overlapping or highly related to each other. MOGEF set promotion of multicultural education as a detailed task and gave a role to MOE. The following <Table 7> shows that the detailed tasks set by the MOGEF are embodied in MOE's policy tasks.

<Table 7> Policy Linkage in schools and teachers

Area	MOGEF	MOE
	Policy Tasks	Policy Tasks
Creating an Environment (school)	IV.2-② Multicultural education of early childhood education and public education institutions	III.1-① Multicultural education throughout the school curriculum
Education Support	IV.2-③ Improving teachers' multicultural capabilities of and promoting multicultural education at school	II.2-② Support for school adaptation and human resource development III.2-① Strengthening multicultural capabilities for incumbent teachers III.2-② Development of multicultural capabilities of pre-service teachers

In the environment creation area, MOGEF shall reflect multicultural education in Nuri course and elementary/secondary education, and strengthen multicultural understanding education for nursery teachers and daycare center teachers to create an environment where multicultural acceptance can be instilled(IV.2-②). Meanwhile, MOE establishes policies for creating the environment only for compulsory education.

In the area of education support, both ministries commonly suggest policies to enhance teachers' multicultural capabilities and revitalize multicultural education at school sites. As MOGEF has designated a teacher related policy task(IV.2-③)

to MOE, MOE suggests teachers' training and workshops in cooperation with related institutions(e.g. the National Institute of Korean Language, the Central Multicultural Education Center, and the Central Education Training Institute). More than 15 hours of training are recommended for incumbent teachers(III.2-①) per year, and it also encouraged for pre-service teachers(III.2-②).

In the case of linkage point, we need to take a first look at MOE's policy changes in environment creation area. MOE has operated a 'multicultural school' since 2014, and began operating a 'multicultural kindergarten' in 2015. As those schools are reorganized into the 'Multicultural Education Policy School' project from 2019, it is necessary to move toward strengthening regional autonomy in relation to regional areas as followed.

2) Central and local governments

The policy linkage characteristics in central and local governments are shown in the <Table 8>.

<Table 8> Policy Linkage in central and local governments

Area	MOGEF	MOE
	Policy Tasks	Policy Tasks
Creating an Environment (legal)		IV.1-① Improvement of the Act on Multicultural Education
Creating an Environment (Regional)	IV.4-① Discovery and diffusion of local programs IV.4-③ Expansion of multicultural programs in cultural facilities	III.3-② Strengthening community links and public relations
Institutional Cooperation	V.1-① Strengthening institutional cooperation and linking plans V.1-② Strengthening the capacity of local governments to promote policies V.1-③ Revitalization of regional centers with related agencies V.1-④ Continuous operation of cooperative channels with major marriage partner nations V.2-① Operating support system reflecting regional needs V.2-② Improving the service capabilities of the Multicultural Family Support Center	IV.3-① Strengthening exchanges and cooperation of leading human resources through the Multicultural Education Support Group IV.3-② Establishing a close promotion system through multicultural education centers IV.3-③ Promoting interdepartmental collaboration at the central level

[Provider:article] Download by IP 165.246.136.212 at Friday, July 23, 2021 11:44 AM

In the perspective of legal environment, MOE is considering revising the *ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT* to create a legal foundation for multicultural education(V.1-①). The main contents include the scope of multi-ethnic students, whether the school principals are obliged to support, support plan for special classes, and the basis for the legal establishment of national and regional support centers. MOGEF does not separately present policy related to the legal environment, but as described later, it can find links in connection with future tasks.

In relation to the area of institutional cooperation, as shown in <Table 8>, both ministries set up a detailed task to strengthen cooperation between policy promotion systems. Since multicultural policies correspond to pan-ministerial policies, the above detailed tasks seem to have been set up because coordination between ministries in charge is important.

In the regional cooperation area, MOGEF intends to discover and spread excellent multicultural programs in the community and operate programs to support exchanges between migrants and residents(e.g., migrant background youth integration camps, rainbow bridge projects, etc.) (IV.4-①). In addition, it intends to expand multicultural programs by exhibiting multicultural works, such as third-world exhibitions, or creating migrant cultural experience facilities within cultural facilities(Library, Museum, etc.) (IV.4-③). Likewise, MOE also points out that it is necessary to establish an integrated community-centered multicultural education support system to create a harmonious educational environment in which diverse cultures coexist by expanding multicultural education from the 2020 Multicultural Education Support Plan to students and teachers(III.3-②).

Looking at the linked points, MOGEF suggests that unlike previous plans that focused on changing individual members' perceptions and attitudes, the 3<sup>rd</sup> master plan requires a socio-cultural approach such as law and institution from a mid- to long-term perspective. This could be discussed in conjunction with MOE's efforts to improve laws and institutions.

Secondly, a linkage in institutional cooperation is to establish an interdepartmental collaboration system. Academics and the government are also aware of the lack of efficiency in implementing policies due to the dispersion of promotional institutions.

Therefore, in February 2019, the government announced the ‘Innovative Embracing National Social Policy Promotion Plan’ and pointed out that the government needs to draw up a map of state administration of social policies to improve the quality of life and improve social issues. To improve this, accurate demand for policies in each region should be identified at the central administrative level and the direction of policies should be presented. In addition, central government will be able to demonstrate the effectiveness of multicultural policy projects by discovering regional specialization projects in conjunction of local governments, Multicultural Family Support Center, and Regional Multicultural Education Support Center. Furthermore, it is expected that the launch of an integrated organization that can encompass all multicultural policies in the region (Kim Young-soon, 2020; Choi Young-joon, 2018).

Finally, the linked points in relation to the area of regional environment are as follows: Research of Kim Hye-sook (2020) concluded that programs conducted by local governments were almost similar to MOE's multicultural education support plan. In addition, a study by Bae Sung-chan and the organization (2013) argued that education policies for multicultural families are receiving duplicate benefits from related institutions due to an unsystematic administrative system, and that programs need to be reorganized. Both ministries also aware of that and MOGEF integrated Health Family Support Center and Multicultural Family Support Centers accordingly. However, it still does not cover the entire foreign and regional characteristics. Therefore, effective policy implementation should be carried out through the establishment of policy tasks that highlight local characteristics and the practice of connections between communities and families.

#### IV. Conclusion and Discussion

This study explored the linked characteristics by comparing and analyzing MOGEF's the 3<sup>rd</sup> Plan and MOE's Multicultural Education Support Plan. The summary of this study results are as follows; First, a policy link between MOGEF and MOE is essential for multi-ethnic parents. In particular, MOGEF's ‘creating an environment’ area should include MOE's policy targets. Second, in the case of

multi-ethnic students, the policy targets of MOE should be covered comprehensively in the policy area of the MOGEF. In addition, education-related policies of the MOGEF should be implemented with in depth discussion by MOE. Third, for the general public, it is necessary to present a unified direction in the area of environmental creation, and to consider the fact that MOGEF is in charge of educational support. Fourth, in the case of institutions, MOGEF and MOE are collectively cooperating between the central and regional areas, and cross-border cooperation is only conducted between the central centers. As the current status of multiculturalism varies by region, cross-border cooperation needs to be carried out intimately at the regional level, while emphasizing regional characteristics.

The results and implications are as follows: First, the redefinition and linkage of policy targets should be made. Both ministries' programs are getting ineffective due to differences and overlaps in policy targets, despite the clear existence of linked characteristics. For example, they both aimed for stable growth of multi-ethnic students as a common goal. However, MOGEF's policy targets parents and children of multi-ethnic families under stable circumstances, but MOE's targets those with unstable family environment. Since the biggest influence on the growth of children is their parents, not their policies (Kim Ki-young, 2017; Yoo Jung-kyun, 2020; Lee Jin-sun, 2018; Lee Hyung-ha, 2019; Electronic Bae, 2018; Wang Yiqia et al.), it is necessary to deal with multi-ethnic students at the scope of MOE rather than MOGEF.

Secondly, through the examination of discourse on multiculturalism, it is necessary to create a unified policy direction. MOGEF has been criticized as a narrow policy target of multicultural families (Kang Ki-jung, Park Soo-sun, 2014). Kim Eun-kyung (2020) assessed that the early policy was called 'International Marriage Women's Family' and that it is a policy that focuses on marriage immigrant women in that the department in charge of the policy is MOGEF. Despite supporting them as beneficial targets within the policy, the negative perception of marriage migrant women remains (Kim Mi-jung, 2016; Shin Jeong-ah, 2019; Yang Jung-hye, Oh Chang-woo, 2008). This can also be seen in the MOE's policy, which confirmed in previous discussions that multi-ethnic students were regarded only as socially vulnerable. These passive concepts of limiting the realm of multiculturalism to migrants has typified them



as foreign beings and made them recognize them as passive beings who must adapt unilaterally to Korean society. Kim Young-soon and Choi Yoo-sung(2020) stated that efforts to recognize and respect individuals from various cultural backgrounds should be made while maintaining their ethnic identity, not forcing migrants to unilaterally absorb or adapt to social integration. They also said that real social integration will be achieved when previous residents and migrants work together and communicate, not only forcing them to foster mutual cultural communication skills.

Finally, various policy support is needed for integrated areas. Currently, the policies of the two ministries are mainly focused on cultural integration division, and some structural integration policy division are presented. In the case of structural integration, it is operated mainly by cooperation among institutions, and there is no policy for migrants to participate in inflow countries as members of the group. This can be seen as a problem caused by social integration policies in the top-down format. Due to different multicultural environment of each area, a few discussion has been made on what support and promotion systems are needed, despite the need for multicultural policies tailored to the characteristics of the region(Kim Young-jae, 2020, Kim Hye-sook, 2020). Therefore, it is necessary to consider not only cooperation at the level of national administration, but also the direction in which centers in each region are linked with autonomy. Therefore, it is necessary to discover policies through cross-border links at the regional level through cooperation of members. This structural integration may naturally lead to the integration of the identity of migrants and their the sense of belonging.

The limitation of this study may be that it compared only multicultural policies of MOGEF and MOE. Nevertheless, this study is meaningful that it has reflected the reality that it does not deviate from existing criticism and presented linkage possibility. These discussion should proceed to more in-depth concerns about what is required in multicultural society.

## References

- Bae, S. C., & Pyun, S. J. (2013). A study on the development of a integrating management system in education · welfare service for multicultural children. *Korean Journal of Local Government & Administration Studies* 27(1), 293–318.
- Baek, E. S., & Park, H. M. (2013). The direction and task of multicultural education from the perspective of lifelong education. *Association of Social Education in Korea*, 203–215.
- Castels, S., & Miller, M. J. (1998). *The age of migration* (2nd ed.). London: Macmillan.
- Choi, S. E. (2015). *A study on the experience in music education of elementary teachers from the perspective of intercultural education*, Doctoral Dissertation, Inha University.
- Choi, Y. J. (2018). The suggestions and the changes of multicultural education policies in Korea. *The Journal of Lifelong Education and HRD* 14(2), 55–75.
- Eun, J. Y. (2020). A comparative analysis of multicultural education policies in South Korea and the United States. *Korean Journal of Teacher Education* 36(1), 193–220.
- Hwang, J. M. (2010). Multicultural education without multicultural citizen—An analysis of policy agenda for multicultural education in Korea—. *Discourse* 13(2), 93–123.
- Hyun, J. K. (2013). *Necessity and direction of social integration*, Korea Economic Research Institute.
- Ji J. H., Chung, M. J., & Kim, D. K. (2009). The phenomena of muticultural nation and new policy model in Korea. *Local Government Studies* 13(2), 109–136.
- Jin, H. L., & Lim, C. W. (2014). A study on the social integration policy in south Korea: A model of coexistence and interaction. *Studies of Koreans Abroad* 32, 299–330.
- Jung, J. G. (2017). *Theories of policy science*. Seoul: 大明出版社.
- Kang, K. J., & Park, S. S. (2014). A study on expert opinions about multicultural family policy and delivery system on the social integration perspective in the multicultural age: Focused on multicultural family support projects. *Korean Journal of Family Welfare* 19(4), 669–691.
- Kim, E. G. (2020). *A study on social repositioning and multicultural family policy: An analysis of social constructionism perspective*. Doctoral Dissertation, Chung-Ang University.
- Kim, H. G., & So, K. H. (2018). A study on changes of the nature of multicultural

- education in Korean multicultural education policy documents. *Multicultural Education Studies* 11(2), 59–83.
- Kim, H. S. (2007). *Theoreticalization of Korean multiculturalism*. Seoul: Presidential Committee on Northeast Asian Cooperation Initiative.
- Kim, H. S. (2020). *A comparative analysis study on multicultural education support plans of the metropolitan and provincial offices of education in Korea*. Master's Thesis, Seoul National University of Education.
- Kim, H. T. (2015). A study on legal policies for social integration in multicultural society—Focused on social integration models of Korea and EU—. *European Constitution* 18, 127–170.
- Kim, J. H. (2016). Moving toward justice beyond tolerance: (Re)consideration of multicultural society based on Derrida's philosophy of 'hospitality'. *Multicultural Education Studies* 9(4), 119–137.
- Kim, J. S., & An, G. H. (2012). A critical review of the basic plan for supporting multicultural families. *The Journal of Korean Policy Studies* 12(4), 127–150.
- Kim, K. Y. (2017). A study on the changing process of multicultural education policies. *Legislation and Policy Studies* 9(1), 371–393.
- Kim, M. S. (2009). Research on the improvement of social integration among multicultural families support policy. *Journal of Social Work Practice* 8, 5–29.
- Kim, S. J. (2015). *A study on the social integration of multicultural society in Korea*. Doctoral Dissertation, Dong-A University.
- Kim, T. H. (2015). *Understanding multicultural society and Korean immigration policy*. Seoul: Jibsajae.
- Kim, Y. S. (2017). *Humanities of multicultural society and coexistence*. Gyeonggi: D&B Books.
- Kim, Y. S., & Choi, Y. S. (2020). Exploring intercultural communication of married migrant women for social integration. *Contemporary Society and Multiculture* 10(4), 91–126.
- Koopmans, R., Statham, P., Guigni, M., & Passy, F. (2005). *Contested citizenship: Immigration and cultural diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford University Press.
- Lee, J. Y. (2010). A study of the multicultural policy in the Republic of Korea. *Journal of Multi-Cultural Contents Studies* (4), 163–185.
- Lee, S. J., Min, M. S., Shin, H. O., & Lee, T. J. (2009). *Constructing a policy paradigm for a transition to multiethnic and multicultural society in Korea: The*

- enhancement of integration and cooperation systems*. Korean Women's Development Institute.
- Min, G. Y. (2011). A research on experiences of multicultural policy by married immigrant women. *Journal of Social Science 22(1)*, 83–104.
- Ministry of Education. (2018~2021). *Multicultural education support plan*. Retrieved from MOE Press Release.
- Park, J. K. (2010). Characteristics and development direction of Korean multicultural policy. *The Korean Association for Policy Studies Summer Conference and International Academic Conference*.
- Park, S. U. (2018). Comparative study on legal policies for multicultural society and social integration. *Dankook Law Review 42(2)*, 185–217.
- Troper, H. (1999). Multiculturalism. In P. R. Magocsci (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Canada's people* (pp. 997–1006). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Yoo, S. R. (2011). A study on immigrant integration typology and integration policy shifts: Focusing on swedish and dutch cases. *International Regional Studies 20(2)*, 65–96.

Received 29 April 2021 / Received version received 9 June 2021 / Accepted 23 June 2021

